

## REMARKS

Remaining in the case is Claim 7 with dependent Claims 8-13 and Claim 14 with dependent Claims 15, 16 and 19-21.

In the Office Action, Examiner Balsis rejected the independent Claims 7 and 14. However, the examiner indicated that dependent Claim 17 and 18 include allowable subject matter. Specifically, Examiner Balsis has observed that the prior art patents to Powers, Smith, Breston and Cholet fail to teach the concept of a nose cone that includes a bypass passageway, siphon passageway and venturi as does Applicant's invention.


Accordingly, it is believed that independent Claim 7 and 14 are clearly allowable over the prior art.

New Claims 20 and 21 add that the nose cone is formed of non-metallic material--a concept also lacking in the prior art.

The new Abstract is intended to more clearly encompass the scope of parent Claims 7 and 14.

It is respectfully suggested that the Application should be in condition for a Notice of Allowance which is respectfully requested. It is understood there is no fee due at this time. However, should a fee deficiency have occurred, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1971 per 37 C.F.R. § 1.25.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul H. Johnson      Date: November 11, 2004  
Registration No. 19,224  
PTO Customer No. 32,128  
GABLE & GOTWALS  
100 West 5th St., 10th Floor  
Tulsa, OK 74103  
Tel: (918) 595-4963  
Fax: (918) 595-4990  
E-mail: [iplaw@gablelaw.com](mailto:iplaw@gablelaw.com)